

Question: What are the mechanics of a quality peer review process?

Group B Breakout 2

Reporter: Dr. Tae Oum

[View Schematic](#)

Purposes and Infrastructure

The goal of the peer review process is to insure that research conducted under NETS meets or exceeds national standards for research. The process outlined below is designed to meet this goal by the formation of an advisory committee (NETS Advisory Committee) which will coordinate and review and evaluate reviewers of proposed and executed research projects and will make recommendations to IWR. This Committee should be comprised of people from the IWR, the academic community, other federal agencies, and other members of the ACE. The rationale of the membership of the Committee is insure that relevant research is conducted and that the research conducted is of the up most quality. The rationale for the advisory role of the committee is to insure that funding decisions remain in the hands of IWR. The primary role of the committee is to make recommendations to IWR on proposals and projects and to coordinate review efforts.

Process

1. In collaboration with IWR, principles and investigator(s) will submit a proposal to IWR.
2. IWR will pass the proposal to the Committee who will screen proposal and recommend to IWR whether the project proposal should be reviewed and/or undertaken (i.e., not all proposals need to follow a strict regimented review process). They will also identify possible reviewers, timelines of reviewers for the project proposals, and the nature of the review.
3. IWR receives the Committee recommendation and determines if a review process is necessary.
4. If a review of the proposal is mandated, the reviewers are contacted and the proposal review is initiated.
5. On completion of the review(s), the Committee makes a recommendation to IWR on changes to be made in the proposed research.
6. Principles are given an opportunity to respond to reviewers comments.
7. If IWR approves the proposed research, the research is executed and submitted to IWR by the principles.
8. An interim report is provided to the advisory committee who then identifies reviewers of the research.
9. Reviewers provide comments to the Committee who then review the executed research and forms a recommendation to IWR (accept the research or request revisions of the research).
10. Upon successful review or successful revisions, IWR approves the project.

ISSUES

There were a number of issues that were deemed of considerable import and other issues that were not resolved.

1. The membership of the Committee was eclectic. It was by purpose to insure that not only are the standards of academic excellence met but also that the

expertise of insiders and related federal agencies was present. It was noted throughout that the reputation of both the board and the reviewers was critical to the accomplishment of the goals of the process.

2. The issue of the extent of Committee power was amply discussed. In the end, it seemed that there was consensus for the advisory role of the Committee.
3. There was also a few unresolved issues relating to the reviewers. Specifically, there was discussion of whether the proposal reviewers and the executed

research reviewers should be the same or mixed. There was also the issue of anonymity of reviewers.